The Bible Tells Us when to be Liberal or Conservative in Our Actions

Written by Joshua Leonard

Patrick J. Deneen understood, with a deep and accurate perception, the political theory of liberalism when he wrote his book *Why Liberalism Failed.* Frankly, I was expecting to hear the shallow, mistaken definition of liberalism that our currently ever-more conservative society believes. It took me many years of research to obtain a deeper understanding of liberalism and other such elemental concepts. I am impressed with Deneen's book. His analysis on the matter very much correlates with mine with only a few exceptions. This leads me to believe that my beliefs about liberalism are correct.

My political thought involves more than what is portrayed in Patrick Deneen's book. He did a very good job at covering the truth behind liberalism as the first and sole surviving of the three great competitor political ideologies, the other two being fascism and communism. He explains how the success of liberalism has brought about its own demise. In his conclusion, he expresses his concept of culture in a post-liberal era. Deneen has organized the puzzle pieces and put a lot of them in place in his accurate concept of a post-liberal era. I have the few final puzzle pieces needed to complete my political thought.

Liberalism, in its essence, is the belief that individual human beings are entitled to decide on everything when practiced on property and possessions that do not belong to anyone. It advocates that the ability of every individual to make decisions in public should not be constrained by others. Indeed, the uncountable number of common, acceptable actions we take in our everyday lives within our communities is all part of the advantage of liberalism.

Liberty in reality is the concept that individuals have the right to govern everything that belongs to them. Deneen defines liberty as the absence of law and government. Well, where the law and government are absent, the private domain exists. The first thing liberty does is guarantee that you can decide what to do with your own property and possessions. Liberty grants us the right to deny or permit others the use of our possessions. Liberty gives you control over every life that lives on your property. If you hire an employee, then you have the right to tell him what to do for as long as his employment lasts. If an employer hires you, then he has the right to tell you what to do for as long as your employment lasts. An employer owns his employee for as long as his employee consents to be owned. In other cases, some people do not have the right to no longer consent. Bond servants forfeit their rights in an exchange for something else that they signed a contract for. Prisoners involuntarily lose their right in recompense for their illegal actions. Children belong to their parents for as long as they live together in the same household. True liberty is the existing right of property owners to govern what belongs to them.

It is generally accepted in liberalism that each individual's life is their own property. It would not be liberal for someone else to command you to do or not to do something with your own person on public property. In a state of liberalism, people express their own thoughts, beliefs, and actions with little fear of consequence.

Culture is the general agreement of widespread beliefs practiced within a community. To get along with other people, they find common ground in their way of life. From there, they reach a consensus on what they believe is the right way to behave in public. An action is deemed appropriate when it is beneficial or at least harmless to the property and

lives within that community. Actions that harm the property and lives within that community are considered unnatural and inappropriate. Such harmful actions are frowned upon, or even condemned, in that society. A common culture maintains peace between citizens involved in that common practice.

Most common beliefs found in culture are derived from the observation of nature and what results from nature. Nature is the reality of how things really are. It consists of tautologies that cannot be logically refuted. People will always get hungry and thirsty eventually. The sun will rise the next morning. Two apples added to two more apples make a total of four apples. Unless a community observes some natural phenomena, they will accept common observations as facts of nature. Nature often has an outstanding role in establishing common ground between individuals who are part of a culture.

Conservatism is the belief that there are fundamental beliefs. Certain actions are either right, or they are wrong. If there is only one right action to take, an individual should only be allowed to make the one right decision. If an action is undeniably wrong, an individual must not be allowed to make that decision. If an action is truly right, it will always be right. If an action is truly wrong, it will always be wrong. Such fundamental principles are not meant to be argued or questioned. Even if popular opinion disagrees with a fundamental principle, such laws should never be repealed.

Fundamental principles can differ between private property and public property. An individual has the right to establish what is either right or wrong on his own property. Any person on his property has to obey his rules or otherwise leave. Because it is in the interest of almost every individual to not have their property or life encroached upon, the community creates its fundamental principles based on its culture. The only

thing that prevents an individual's life and property from being harmed is the principle that no one else wants their life and property to be harmed.

The average community has, to some extent, some balance between liberalism and conservatism. It is healthy for a culture to not be too liberal nor too conservative. A good community will always adhere to its underlying principles. When something is not quite so definite, a community should allow its citizens to make their own decisions. A commonly held opinion can be legislated into law, yet a law derived from popular opinion can be repealed. In a decent community, its citizens should not have to fear breaking local violations over harmless incidents. Most communities are either going to be a little too liberal or conservative. Liberty and order will coexist, provided there is a proper amount of both within a community.

There has been a redefining of liberalism. The old-fashioned form of liberalism, known as classic liberalism, is the broader form of liberalism, which simply implies that people can make decisions for themselves. The new form of liberalism, progressive liberalism, strives on the hard-core belief that every person should be allowed to decide on their own lifestyle regardless of the beliefs of the community they live in. They feel that no one should be bound by fundamental principles within nature and culture. Progressive liberals insist that everyone should be liberated from their bonds of culture and tradition. They see the employer-employee, ruler-subject, and parent-child relationships as intolerable acts of injustice. They imply that people should only live for the present without any regard for the results of the past or the consequences of the future. They go as far as to say that people should not be limited by their unalterable bounds in nature.

The purpose of liberalism fails when it succeeds. The traditional sense of culture has to be eradicated for liberalism to succeed. When they

accomplish their goal of complete liberation of individuals from their culture, the result is one giant monoculture, or rather anti-culture. They go about doing this by devising a liberal leviathan government that forces their culture to guarantee them the choice of every fleshy want that they desire. All people within the state are compelled to accept a universal belief that being part of a multi-cultural order will make them free. When the fundamental beliefs are eradicated, they are replaced by other fundamental beliefs of inclusion, diversity, and relativism. No longer can each individual have a part in governing their own decisions and property; the government will govern his life for him. The method of their success defeats the objective purpose that an individual would want from liberalism.

The liberal state makes you believe what they believe through the public education system. It is taught in schools that the only right way to think is to believe the word of the so-called intellectual elitists. You are told that the dictations of the great experts so-called such as Albert Einstein, Benjamin Spock, and Anthony Fauci are not to be questioned. Any proclamation that they make is accepted as if it were law. It is considered taboo to disprove their beliefs, even if you have valid evidence against their beliefs. First, the minds of children are molded in public schools by the unalterable yet false beliefs of the monoculture. Such false beliefs portray the deity of man’s accomplishments and the absence of God within nature. Students who excel through college and later achieve many doctorate degrees are considered the ideal candidates for elitist status. They are only free to profess what the state wants them to profess. Otherwise, professors who attempt to speak contrary to the beliefs of the liberal agenda will be utterly removed from their high status in society. The so-called experts that teach us the propaganda of the monoculture are more interested in

universal consent than in the truth.

Liberals believe that an individual's consent to stay within his culture is not truly free unless he is given the choice to leave. This belief is likely derived from Hobbes' book *Leviathan.* He said that an individual is under contract to obey his ruler if he consents to do so. Liberals argue that individuals should be ruled only if they consent to being ruled. In part, I can see myself agreeing with that belief. Liberals do not believe that as much as they think they do. Hobbes went on to say that everyone left within a state that did not consent to be ruled must consent to be ruled when everyone else does. The hypocrisy of liberalism is evident when they force the remaining die-hards who oppose the liberal monoculture to consent to their mainstream agenda. An example given by Patrick Deneen of such a culture the liberals are pointing fingers at is the Amish community. The Amish community chooses for its members not to permit all modern-day technologies. While it is true that a liberal society has more choices to choose from, they are bonded in their minds to believe they cannot live without such technologies. They cannot see going without their phone, computer, or automobile. The Amish exercise more freedom by being able to be content without such technologies. An Amish individual can permanently leave his community if he wants to, but nearly all of them remain in their community. Even if the Amish people were not given that choice to leave, they would still be just as free because they are content.

In America, the practice of liberalism has been taken to its progressive and unreasonable extreme. The desires of criminals are granted, and American citizens are forbidden to attempt to stop them. Looters are legally allowed to steal up to a thousand dollars in merchandise each day. Murderers have very little reason to fear capital punishment. The

encouragement of recreational and medical drugs is now advertised. Queers publicly flaunt in front of children that which is hostile to any culture. Rape and pedophilia are considered less illegitimate, provided abortion and contraceptives are legal. Very few Americans approve of looting, killing, raping, drug use, and perverting their children. If we attempt to stop these criminals from committing what we believe is fundamentally wrong, then our unrepresentative government will interfere by making it illegal to interfere with the so-called ‘rights’ of such minorities. That is the makings of a liberal democracy. The populace of virtue-loving citizens gets one vote, the queers get one vote, and the pedophiles get one vote. Already, the vast majority gets outvoted within the number of conflicting interests.

In a true democracy, its citizens are allowed to get together and punish acts of wickedness with their own hands. This is why I believe Russia is more of a democracy than America is. They do not grant such immunities to criminals. The Russian government does not issue marriage licenses to homosexuals, yet it does not prosecute most homosexual acts either. Instead, the Russian government does not restrain its people from prosecuting criminals for acts harmful to their society. If a queer or pedophile walked into a Russian village, the townspeople would have the freedom to put that evil away from among themselves. A very similar form of democratic justice existed in ancient Israel. Capital punishment was carried out by letting the people stone the wicked with stones. Unlike a liberal democracy, a true democracy lets the masses govern themselves.

Most Americans now see the dangers of radical liberalism, yet they are unaware that their minds are still enveloped by the theory of liberalism. They define liberalism as anything political that threatens our own property or culture. Vast swaths of Americans have taken a contemptible view

towards liberalism. Americans have only in recent years recognized that extremely hostile position advocated by liberals, which has become so blatantly obvious. What Americans do not recognize is that their own hunger for being granted anything they desire justifies the wicked for having their own evil desires. In comparison to Plato's allegory of the divided line, Americans now view liberalism as bad only because of its apparent harmful effects. Why is liberalism bad? Is there more to this than meets the eye? Is there something that I am doing wrong that feeds the liberal agenda? They have yet to take that extra step further to ask those questions, let alone search for the answers.

What Americans don't realize is that both political parties mostly practice liberalism and very little conservatism. The Republicans, who call themselves conservatives, are in reality advocates of classic liberalism. The Democrats, who are evidently considered liberal, practice the new concept of progressive liberalism. Conservatism is used just as seldom on both sides. Republicans hold to a few fundamental beliefs, and the Democrats likewise have their own. Of course, liberalism is essential where it applies, yet it should be equally balanced with conservatism where it applies. Americans need to understand that there is more to life than what benefits themselves at that moment. That manner of thinking is the same as that of criminals. Americans will have that healthy dose of conservatism if they keep consistent to their actions about what they believe is right or wrong, regardless of whether it benefits them or not.

Every culture and community is going to be wrong in some way or another. Because every culture has different laws and beliefs, it is apparent that each one of them has its flaws. Different cultures deduce different conclusions about fundamental beliefs. Different conclusions are often

reached from observations in nature. When theories about nature are mistakenly wrong, then the beliefs surrounding such theories are going to be wrong as well. An individual from one culture is probably not going to accept the beliefs of another culture. If that individual does, he will become an outcast in his own society. This is where the liberals find their best arguing point to advocate for liberalism. However, each culture often gets many things right. Contrarily, the liberal monoculture will get everything wrong for everyone. It is wrong to completely liberate an individual from his culture, yet it can also be harmful to be contained by culture.

How can we tell when to be liberal and when to be conservative with our actions? That is the big question. Each culture erroneously manages to permit its people to do wicked deeds. Each culture also compels its people to do acts that will ultimately be harmful to the people themselves. From a standpoint in which we know our own culture has its flaws, we cannot really tell the difference between right, wrong, and optional. If there was no true definition of right and wrong, we would govern ourselves in the manner of tyrants. Physical infliction would be the only thing that would prevent us from doing whatever we pleased with other lives and other people's property. We would condemn others just for the reason that we do not like them. It is imperative to know the right time to be liberal or conservative with our actions, yet our culture will not always give us the right answer to that question.

The Bible has all of the inerrant answers to when to be liberal and when to be conservative with our actions. There are 613 commandments in the Bible. They are the fundamental principles that are undeniably true. The facts in the Bible about the natural world are also undeniably true. The Bible has an answer for every single problem that might arise. You just have

to search deep enough to find that answer. They are not to be questioned. It will always be wrong to violate the commandments, regardless of what our own opinion is.

Many might view the Bible as overly conservative, yet the Bible in reality is equally just as liberal as it is conservative in its formula of pure righteousness. Where there is no mention in the law of God, we are free to do as we please. In contrast to the 613 commandments, the laws of man are so numerous that we have lost count of how many there are. There is exceedingly more freedom in God's law than in man's law.

If a community were able to abide by all of God's laws, accept all facts of God's nature, and exercise free will with all that God gives to them freely, then that community would be a utopia or a Callipolis. Our sinful nature makes it fundamentally impossible to obtain a true utopia here on Earth. Such a utopia only exists in Heaven where there is no sin. In Plato's *Republic*, he too acknowledged that the ideal city, Callipolis, is impossible to attain. However, he also said that it is a goal to reach for. The closer a community follows the Word of God, the more Heaven-like that community is going to be.

There are conservative beliefs in America which contradict the Bible. By conservative, I still do not mean classical liberalism. There are too many times when man's laws restrict our freedoms when the Bible consents that we should have those rights. The first ten amendments of the United States Constitution are there to protect our liberal rights. Unless the Bible says otherwise, those unalienable rights should never be abridged.

A common example of claiming that the Constitution has loopholes is the fact that you cannot yell fire in a crowded theater. If there really is a fire, I hope you do yell fire. If there is no fire, then that is lying, which is a

sin. Freedom of speech's only exceptions are that it is wrong to lie, swear, or commit blasphemy with your mouth. However, it is a wrongfully conservative action to prosecute against so-called hate speech. Whereas it may be mean to say something dirty about someone else, provided it is not a lie, it would be downright wrong to throw someone in jail over it.

Gun control is an extremely conservative movement supported by today's progressive liberals. Again, the Constitution grants the right to bear arms, and the Bible supports the right to self-defense. With the exception of prisoners, no single American should be denied the right to own a gun. It is rather the action of shooting a gun that might not necessarily be protected by the Constitution and the Bible. I remember when fifteen year old Ethan Crumbley killed four students in a school shooting in Michigan. Of course he did horribly wrong. The correct judgment for him should have been capital punishment instead of life imprisonment. What makes my blood boil is that the Michigan government charged his parents with involuntary manslaughter. Immediately after seeing that, the first thing that came to my mind was Deuteronomy 24:16 The fathers shall not be put to death for the children, neither shall the children be put to death for the fathers: every man shall be put to death for his own sin. Those parents did absolutely nothing wrong. I do not recall there being an age limit on the Second Amendment. It should be the parents choice whether or not they give their child a gun. Most parents are not about to give their child a gun. If they do, they will hopefully have enough assurance that he will not use the gun for murder. If the fifteen year old boy was put to death as the Bible prescribed, then the parents would have felt an exceedingly more unbearable punishment. Other parents would then give it more thought before they allowed their children to own guns. The Michigan government committed a

gross miscarriage of justice by prosecuting the parents. Their wicked motive was to have an excuse to push more unconstitutional gun control laws.

Two other conservative beliefs wrongly held by progressive liberals are the concepts of environmentalism and climate change. Patrick Deneen correctly points out that liberals take a conservative stance on global warming, and so-called conservatives take a liberal stance on that issue. From what I gather, Deneen's biggest mistake is that he supports the conservation movement, and he downplays individuals whose actions he claims accelerate climate change. There is no such thing as climate change. It is a belief about nature strongly held by many, yet it is dead wrong. I know so because the Bible says in Genesis 8:22 While the earth remaineth, seedtime and harvest, and cold and heat, and summer and winter, and day and night shall not cease. He is crazy enough to believe the so-called scientific elitists that he warned about controlling the minds of a liberal democracy. He thinks that people who deny the evidence that the world is heating up are crazy. What evidence? Are we to believe the world is heating up just because the so-called expert Al Gore said so? Not once has a single prediction about climate change ever come true. As far as the environmental conservation movement is concerned, God granted man the liberty to have dominion over all of the Earth. Time is going to end long before the Earth's resources are depleted. With a few Biblical exceptions, property such as land, plants, and animals do not have any rights of their own. I, like many, view the harm and destruction of property as unethical; I never try to do it myself if I can help it. However, I personally do not care how someone else treats their property. To fine or throw someone in jail because he abused an animal is a gross miscarriage of justice. I would

consider that the abuse of another human being. I will go as far as to agree with John Lock's two provisos. We should leave enough resources for everyone, and we should not let resources spoil. It is Biblically correct to take a liberal stance against the climate change and conservation movements.

When should the Biblical principle of conservatism be enforced? What is right will always be right, and what is wrong will always be wrong. When this principle is broken, sometimes there should be earthly consequences, and sometimes they may not be enforced. In general, commandments that are enforced by law pertain to our interactions with other people and their property. What you do to others and their property should likewise be done the same or even worse to you. I would call this the law of tit for tat. If you harm a man, the judgement will allow that man to harm you in the same manner. If you break a man's belongings, you need to make restitution. If you steal a man's belongings, you have to restore to them either double or fourfold. The Biblical commandments that bear no punishment pertain to our own selves and our own property. The Bible says that your body is the temple of the Holy Ghost. We do not own our own selves. We are the property of God. God, as our loving father, commands us not to inflict sin upon ourselves. We should not drink alcohol, eat unclean meats, or print tattoos on our skin. The Bible says not to muzzle the ox which treadeth out the corn. There are no earthly consequences to that law except that your ox might have a shorter life. The Bible says that we should let the ground rest every seventh year. If we do not do that, then the nutrients in the soil will become depleted. God once let Israel disregard that law for 490 years. He had to send them into Babylonian captivity so that Israel's soil could rest for seventy years. Disregarding these laws will have an ill effect on our own

lives. More importantly, it is important to be good hosts of our body because God said to do so. The closer we adhere to His commandments, the closer of a relationship we can have with Him. The last category of commandments pertains to when we sin directly against God. When we commit abominations God hates, such as blasphemy, witchcraft, sodomy, and idol worship, He decides when and how He will hold us all accountable for those actions. He might shine His everlasting mercy on us, or He might subject us to His fierce wrath. The Bible shows us which commandments need to be enforced with earthly judgment.

When should the Biblical principle of liberalism be enforced? We are granted the free will to make decisions when we are given that choice. There are instances when the Bible openly entitles us to freedoms just like those of the US Constitution. One freedom the Bible gives us is the choice of whether or not we want to obey man's laws. Unless man's laws are contrary to the Bible, we are permitted the right to obey laws that are not found in the Bible. At the same time, we can choose not to obey man's laws, but we would then be subjected to man's idea of punishment. Often times, I find it better to distance myself from man's beliefs if it meant having a closer relationship with God. The Bible gives us plenty of advice about these fools. A companion of fools shall be destroyed. I do not want to associate with people who hate God and the Bible. If sinners entice thee, consent thou not. I am going to revolt against their guidelines, even if their edicts are not necessarily unbiblical. There is nothing more harmful than to consent to man's whims just because you fear them. This is where fearing God comes in. The fear of the Lord is the beginning of wisdom. The way to not become foolish is to become wise. That is attained by keeping close to God and keeping close to others who are wise. Whether we decide to be wise or

foolish, that is a liberal, free choice that God gives to everyone. To enforce Biblical liberalism would mean that fools are not allowed to force us to believe their folly.

Who has the authority to enforce the Biblical principles of conservatism and liberalism? All fundamentals and freedoms are good, but it is not quite just anyone's place to usurp authority to enforce them. Whoever takes that position to usurp authority over another needs to bear the consequential results which follow. Someone or something has to essentially be your property in able for you to personally feel whatever happens to it. If you take charge over something and it gets destroyed, you will not care if it was destroyed if it was not your own property. Authority belongs only to them who can bear the consequences.

This makes love an important factor when using authority, both for the ruler and for his subjects. The reason why we obey any of God's laws is out of love. We are either loving God or loving other people when we keep His commandments. A ruler is able to rule with compassion only if he rules what belongs to him. A ruler's people will have a passion to obey his laws only if they love him. When a ruler bears the consequences of what happens to his people and belongings, his judgment is going to be much more beneficial if he rules with a passion.

If a state were to usurp authority to control the well-being of its individual citizens, it would actually care very little about the well-being of those citizens. This would be as if a human were to care for the well-being of the colonies of ants that live in his backyard. It would never affect him if a few thousand of his ants were to die due to his negligence. An all-powerful superstate does not have the capacity to love each and every citizen. This is how an authoritarian state can inflict harm upon its people without any

remorse.

Each authority should be a government to that which it is permitted to govern. There should be five stages of human government: the individual, the family, the community, the state, and the nation. Each stage of government should only be permitted to govern the form of government which precedes it. The family household should govern the individuals who live within it. The community should govern the households within it. The state should only be allowed to govern the local governments within it. The nation should only be allowed to govern the state governments within it. The smaller the government, the more authority it should have. Larger forms of government should only govern the preceding smaller form of government within it. The way larger forms of government govern is by making sure the smaller governments are governing themselves. A state of pure authoritarianism should exist between an authority and its jurisdiction. A state of pure anarchy should exist between an authority and everything outside of its jurisdiction.

The individual is the smallest form of government, known as self-governance. It is the job of each individual to govern themselves and their property according to the principles of liberalism and conservatism, as the Bible intended. The individual cannot in himself run the life of another unrelated individual. He himself would not be able to bear the consequences. Self-governance is meant to be kept to yourself and that which belongs to you.

God himself established the institution called the family. It is the job of the parents to enforce the Biblical principles of liberalism and conservatism upon their family members. Provided it is Biblical, the parents can force their children to do something, or they can compel their children to make

their own decisions. The parents govern their children as they see fit. The parents do have the authority to settle disputes between their children. One family cannot usurp authority over another family. A family passionately governs its own family members out of concern that the family could fall apart.

A group of families or households is called a community. It is the job of the community to practice the Biblical principles of liberalism and conservatism to protect its culture and the families that live within it. I agree very much with Alexis de Toqueville's observations in his book *Democracy in America* about the authority of the community. It is the community that should maintain the laws and freedoms that are meant for individual people. The community does have the authority to settle disputes between its families. The community should see to it that families do govern their children. The community does not have the authority to tell families how to govern their children, yet they should also prevent families from telling their children to do that which is unbiblical. They should simply make sure that families maintain their own self-governance. The community should deal with all Biblically illegal and illiberal actions committed by its individuals when they are outside of their household. This would include capital punishment and the law of tit for tat. Although a community can either choose to punish or extradite a law-breaking individual of another community that is within their city limits, a community cannot usurp authority over another community. Each community has a valid concern for its own residents.

A group of communities is called a state. It is the job of the state to force its communities to govern themselves according to the Biblical principles of liberalism and conservatism. The state should prevent its

communities from governing the children belonging to families. The state should prevent its communities from legislating laws which contradict the Bible. The state does have the authority to settle disputes between its communities. Because the state can never feel the pain or see the problems of the individual, it should never be allowed to directly interfere with the lives of individuals. It should never be allowed to interact with the family households either. One state cannot usurp authority over another state. The state is a loose bond of communities, which altogether should have the one passionately common interests to obey the Bible.

The group of states is known as the United States. The job of the federal government should be to force the states to govern themselves. The federal government should prevent the state governments from governing individuals and families. The federal government should prevent the state governments from forcing their communities to legislate laws which contradict the Bible. The federal government does have the authority to settle disputes between its states. Very similar to the form of a state government, the federal government itself should never interfere with individuals and with families. Because local governments belong to a certain state, the federal government should also not interfere with the jurisdiction of the communities. Unlike other forms of government, the United States government can attempt to usurp authority over other countries, but it can only do so with the consent of its states. The federal government should not be permitted the right to interfere in disputes of which it has no part in between other countries. The valid concern of the United States lies only with the protection of its state governments. The United States should be a loose bond of states, which altogether should have the one passionately common interest to obey the Bible.

Each smaller stage of government should see to it that their larger governments are doing the right thing, according to the Bible. Each state should be concerned with the well-being of their nation. Each community should be concerned with the well-being of their state and nation. Each family should be concerned with the well-being of their community, state, and nation. Each individual should be concerned with the well-being of his family, community, state, and nation. If the nation were to force its states to do the wrong thing, then the states would force their communities to do the wrong thing, the communities would force their families to do the wrong thing, and families would force individuals to do the wrong thing. This is why it is imperative that self-governed individuals have a say in the governance of their government.

I am not advocating rule by religion. Religion, very similar to culture, is anything an individual and his community relies-on. Its fundamental beliefs are randomly true or false, like that of any culture. God and the Bible are not religion in that sense of the word. Whether or not you rely on the Bible, every individual is still subject to its inerrant principles. Congress should make no law respecting an establishment of religion. An establishment of religion specifically means a church. You cannot very easily worship God if you are too busy worshiping your church. The correct use of a church is to be a schoolhouse for individuals to learn how to govern themselves with a better understanding of the Bible. It is wrong for a church to force authority upon anyone outside of the church property. Such a syndicated Catholic church pretends to be God by usurping authority over everything that is way outside its jurisdiction. Its edicts command individuals to worship the church by obeying non-Biblical church commands. So it is correct when Thomas Jefferson advised a separation of

church and state. The state and federal stages of government should stay out of church affairs, and no church should take upon itself the authority of a state or federal government. That does not take away from the fact that no one is above the law of God. The state should obey and take the Word of God at face value in the same manner that the church should. God needs to be the ruler of every stage of government. He needs to be the one who self-governs each individual. He needs to be the one who governs each family. He needs to be the one who governs each community, state, and nation. Everything belongs to God, so He has authority over everything. God knows every single thing about nature because He created it. God bears the consequences for everything that ever happens, which ultimately turns out for the best. God is able to love every creature of His creation with a strong, passionate love. He gave us His Word for His glory and for our well-being. We should give God the command of every stage of government.

The Bible must tell each stage of government when to be liberal or conservative with its actions. There is going to ultimately be only one right way to do what is right. The number of unalienable rights we have is going to remain the same. Any variation away from this one way is going to allow people to do that which is fundamentally wrong and deny people the freedom to do what is truly optional or fundamentally right. Patrick Deneen is correct in his observation that a purely liberal anti-culture is destined to fail. However, I have pointed out that it is not enough to have just any conservative culture. It has to be a blend of both law and freedom, and it can only be the precise blend of law and freedom. Furthermore, authority must be given to the right governors, and authority must not be imposed outside of their jurisdiction. Deneen’s remedy to change the liberal anti-culture is to create a counter-anti-culture, and he is correct. There is only

one way to counter anti-culture of liberalism, and that is the Bible way.

References

The Holy Bible, Authorized King James Version

Deneen, Patrick J. *Why Liberalism Failed*. Yale University Press, 2019.

Plato, and Francis Macdonald Cornford. “Chapters 24 and 29” *The Republic of Plato, Translated with Introduction and Notes by Francis MacDonald Cornford*, Oxford University Press, New York and London, 1941.

Fermon, Nicole, and Mitchell Cohen. “Chapters 12 and 24.” *Princeton Readings in Political Thought*, Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ, 1996.

Deneen, Patrick J. “Heating up: Patrick J. Deneen.” *Heating up*, www.firstthings.com/blogs/firstthoughts/2009/01/heating-up.

Perry, Mark. *18 Spectacularly Wrong Predictions Were Made around the Time of ... - Aei*, www.aei.org/carpe-diem/18-spectacularly-wrong-predictions-were-made-around-the-time-of-the-first-earth-day-in-1970-expect-more-this-year/.

Hoft, Jim. “Parents of Michigan Teen Shooter Ethan Crumbley Charged with 4 Counts of Involuntary Manslaughter: The Gateway Pundit: By Jim Hoft.” *The Gateway Pundit*, www.thegatewaypundit.com/2021/12/parents-michigan-teen-shooter-ethan-crumbley-charged-4-counts-involuntary-manslaughter/.